DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 351 673 CS 011 094

AUTHOR Johnson, Jessie; Morgan, Kathy
TITLE Language Development Component All Day Kindergarten--PIC Program 1991-92, Private Industry Council. Final Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION Columbus Public Schools, OH. Dept. of Program Evaluation.
PUB DATE 9 Dec 92
NOTE 27p.; For the previous report, see ED 329 362.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Schools; *Full Day Half Day Schedules; *Instructional Effectiveness; Kindergarten; Kindergarten Children; *Language Acquisition; Parent Participation; Primary Education; *Remedial Instruction; Underachievement
IDENTIFIERS Columbus Public Schools OH; Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 1; *Print Awareness

ABSTRACT

A study examined the effectiveness of the All Day Kindergarten-PIC Program instituted in the Columbus, Ohio Public Schools that provided full day instruction for underachieving kindergarten pupils. Implementation of the program was accomplished through daily instructional activities to strengthen and extend regular classroom instruction without pursuing the basic reading readiness textbooks. Emphasis was placed on activities which would increase language development and enhance those skills needed to be successful in first grade. Each of two program teachers provided daily instruction for two groups of pupils limited to 12 pupils each. Subjects were administered two locally constructed evaluation instruments. Results indicated that: (1) the program served 58 pupils for an average of 13.5 hours of instruction per week; (2) 31 of the 33 pupils who met attendance criteria had valid scores; (3) 80.6% of those subjects in the evaluation sample successfully completed 12 of the 17 items on a concepts about print test; (4) 83.9% of the pupils had parents who participated in at least one program related activity; and (5) inservice meetings received a very positive rating of 4.7 on a five-point scale by program teachers. Findings suggest that the All Day Kindergarten Program be continued and that consideration be given to the following recommendations: encourage greater parent involvement, provide more teacher inservice, and continue school visitations by the program evaluator. (Four tables of data are included; the Concepts about Print scoring sheet, the form for recording pupil attendance, a parent involvement log, a pupil data sheet, an orientation inservice evaluation form, and a general inservice evaluation form are attached.) (Author/RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED351673

Private Industry Council

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT COMPONENT
ALL DAY KINDERGARTEN-PIC PROGRAM

1991 - 1992

Written by:
Jessie Johnson
Professional Specialist

Under the Supervision of:

E. Jane Williams, Ph.D.

Data Analysis by:

Kathy Morgan
Professional Specialist

Under the Supervision of:

Richard A. Amorose, Ph.D.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Gary Thompson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

Columbus (Ohio) Public Schools
Department of Program Evaluation
Gary Thompson, Ph.D., Director

CS011094

PAP555\RPTPIC92
12-9-92

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Private Industry Council

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT COMPONENT
ALL DAY KINDERGARTEN-PIC PROGRAM
1991-92

ABSTRACT

The All Day Kindergarten-PIC Program, funded through a grant from the Private Industry Council, was instituted in the Columbus Public Schools in August 1991, for the purpose of providing a full day of instruction for underachieving kindergarten pupils. The program was parallel in purpose, methods, materials, and design to other All Day Kindergarten units in the district funded by ESEA Chapter 1. The overall goal of the program is to prepare pupils for first grade. The program provides pupils with an extra half day of instruction in addition to the half day of instruction provided in the regular kindergarten classroom. It is an individualized language based program and provides reinforcement of the skills, concepts, and educational experiences taught in the regular kindergarten classroom. The program operates on the philosophy that the additional help and attention provided by the program will better prepare underachieving kindergarten pupils for successful learning experiences in first grade.

To reach the 1991-92 program goal, two program teachers served in two Chapter 1 eligible elementary schools. The program schools were Maize Rd. and Clinton Elementary. Each All Day Kindergarten-PIC teacher provided daily instruction for two groups of pupils. Groups were limited to 12 pupils each.

Time Interval: For evaluation purposes, the All Day Kindergarten-PIC Program started on September 30, 1991. For evaluation based on achievement test data (Desired Outcome 1), the time interval ended April 3, 1992. This provided a maximum of 117 possible days of instruction for ADK-PIC pupils. An additional 14 scheduled days (through May 1, 1992) were included in the time interval for evaluation of the desired outcome not based on achievement test data (Desired Outcomes 2), providing a maximum of 131 possible days of instruction. To meet the attendance criterion (80%) for inclusion in the analyses of Desired Outcome 1, pupils must have attended at least 93.6 days. To meet the attendance criterion (80%) for inclusion in the analyses of Desired Outcomes 2, pupils must have attended at least 104.8 days.

Activities: Implementation of the program was accomplished through daily instructional activities to strengthen and extend regular classroom instruction without pursuing the basic reading readiness textbooks. Emphasis was placed on activities which would increase language development and enhance those skills needed to be successful in first grade.

Desired Outcomes: The first Desired Outcome stated that at least 50 percent of the pupils who attend the program at least 80 percent of the instructional period will demonstrate an awareness of early concepts about print such that they will successfully complete 12 of 17 items on a concepts about print test (Balloons). Successful completion of at least 12 of 17 items is considered appropriate for promotion to grade 1. The second Desired Outcome declared that parents of at least 75 percent of program pupils in attendance for 80 percent of the instructional period will participate by visiting in the classroom, volunteering in the classroom, assisting with homework, reading to or being read to by their children, or attending parent-teacher conferences during the 1991-92 school year. Records of parent contacts and activities will be maintained by program teachers.

Evaluation Design: The Evaluation Design included the two Desired Outcomes stated above and the instruments used to measure them. Desired Outcome 1 was accomplished through the administration of the Balloons test (locally constructed, 1990), developed by Federal and State Programs, under the Division

of Elementary Schools. Analyses of the data included frequency distributions and averages. Desired Outcome 2 was evaluated by means of a locally constructed instrument.

Major Findings/Recommendations: Pupil census information indicated that the program served 58 pupils for an average of 13.5 hours of instruction per week. The average daily membership in the program was 44.6 pupils. The average number of days scheduled per pupil was 100.8 days and the average number of days pupils were served was 91.1 days. The average number of pupils served per teacher was 29.0.

The attendance criterion for inclusion in Desired Outcome 1 was met by 33 pupils, which was 56.9% of the 58 pupils served. Of those pupils who received an administration of the achievement test, 31 had valid scores.

The data indicated of those tested in the evaluation sample 25 (80.6%) pupils successfully completed 12 of 17 items on the concepts about print test (Balloons); 3 (9.7%) of this number were correct on all 17 items. The desired outcome was achieved.

The second Desired Outcome set a goal that parents of at least 75 percent of program pupils in the treatment group (in attendance 80% of the treatment period) will participate (see Desired Outcome 2, p. 1 of Abstract) during the 1991-92 school year. The data indicated 26 (83.9%) pupils had parents who participated in at least one program related activity during the year. The desired outcome was achieved.

Program teachers attended four inservice meetings during the school year. ADK and ADK-PIC teachers attended the same inservice meetings. Teachers did not indicate program differences on the evaluation form provided. Consequently, the data could not be disaggregated by program (ADK and ADK-PIC). However, overall, the meetings received a very positive rating of 4.7 on a 5-point scale by program teachers. Comments indicated teachers valued the opportunity to share ideas for classroom use, receive useable materials, and to receive information regarding new program/evaluation procedures. Teachers expressed a desire for such meetings to occur again.

Process evaluation was conducted in both program schools to monitor pupil selection procedures of teachers. On-site visitation and inspection of records were instrumental in this process. The data indicated no major problems regarding the reviewed documents. However, some assistance was provided to help teachers better organize information and bring records up to date. Informally, teachers expressed a desire that the current record keeping process be maintained for use during the 1991-92 school year.

In conjunction with the findings of the Chapter 1 All Day Kindergarten Program it is recommended that the All Day Kindergarten program be continued in the 1992-93 school year, and that consideration be given the following three recommendations to enhance program success: encourage greater parent involvement, provide more teacher inservice, and continue school visitations by the program evaluator, especially to those teachers new to the program.

Private Industry Council

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT COMPONENT
ALL DAY KINDERGARTEN-PIC PROGRAM

1991-92

Program Description

The All Day Kindergarten-PIC Program, funded through a grant from the Private Industry Council, was instituted in the Columbus Public Schools in August 1991, for the purpose of providing a full day of instruction for underachieving kindergarten pupils. The program was parallel in purpose, methods, materials, and design to other All Day Kindergarten units in the district funded by ESEA Chapter 1. The overall goal of the program is to prepare pupils for first grade. The program provides pupils with an extra half day of instruction in addition to the half day of instruction provided in the regular kindergarten classroom. It is an individualized language based program and provides reinforcement of the skills, concepts, and educational experiences taught in the regular kindergarten classroom. The program operates on the philosophy that the additional help and attention provided by the program will better prepare underachieving kindergarten pupils for successful learning experiences in first grade.

To reach the 1991-92 program goal, two program teachers served in two Chapter 1 eligible elementary schools. The program schools were Maize Rd. and Clinton Elementary. Each All Day Kindergarten-PIC teacher provided daily instruction for two groups of pupils. Groups were limited to 12 pupils each.

Evaluation Design

Desired Outcomes

Two Desired Outcomes (performance objectives) to be achieved by program pupils were delineated for the All Day Kindergarten-PIC Program as follow:

Desired Outcome I: At least 50 percent of the kindergarten pupils in the treatment group (those pupil's who attended the program at least 80 percent of the instructional period) will demonstrate an awareness of early concepts about print such that they will successfully complete at least 12 of 17 items on a concepts about print test (**Balloons**). Successful completion of at least 12 of 17 items is considered appropriate for promotion to grade 1.

Desired Outcome 2 Parents of at least 75 percent of program pupils in the treatment group (those pupil's who attended the program at least 80 percent of the instructional period) will participate by visiting in the classroom, volunteering in the classroom, assisting with homework, reading to or being read to by their children, or attending parent-teacher conferences during the 1991-92 school year. Records of parent contacts and activities will be maintained by program teachers.

For evaluation purposes, the All Day Kindergarten-PIC Program started on September 30, 1991. For evaluation based on achievement test data (Desired Outcome I), the time interval ended April 3, 1992. This provided a maximum of 117 possible days of instruction for ADK-PIC pupils. An additional 14 scheduled days (through May 1, 1992) were included in the time interval for evaluation of the desired outcome not based on achievement test data (Desired Outcome 2), providing a maximum of 131 possible days of

instruction. To meet the attendance criterion (80%) for inclusion in the analyses of Desired Outcome 1, sample pupils must have attended at least 93.6 days. To meet the attendance criterion (80%) for inclusion in the analyses of Desired Outcome 2, pupils must have attended at least 104.8 days.

Instruments

The evaluation design for the All Day Kindergarten-PIC program called for the collection of data in five areas. A copy of each instrument is found in the Appendix B, with the exception of the computer generated Pupil Roster.

1. Test Information

The BALLOONS: Concepts About Print Assessment[1] (locally constructed, 1990) was used to assess kindergarten pupil achievement gains. The Balloons test is a non-standardized criterion-referenced measure. Program pupils were administered the test the week of April 6, 1992 by program teachers. See Appendix B, pp. 13-14, to see a copy of the Balloons Scoring Sheet (see Footnote, Appendix A).

2. Pupil Census Information

The Calendar Worksheet/Parent Involvement Log. The Calendar Worksheet/Parent Involvement Log (locally constructed) was used to record pupil service information, Selection Scores, and parent involvement information (see Appendix B, pp. 15-16).

Pupil Data Sheet. A Pupil Data Sheet (locally constructed) was completed by ADK-PIC teachers for each pupil served. This instrument was used to collect the following information: pupil progress, hours per week of instruction, English speaking status, indications of parent involvement, number of days of pupil service, and the Balloons test score (see Appendix B, p.17).

Pupil Roster. The Pupil Roster was completed by program teachers to indicate official enrollment of each pupil in the program. Program teachers identified pupils served from a computer generated list of all kindergarten pupils in their building. Information included pupil name, student number, date of birth, program teacher name, school code, and program code.

3. Inservice Evaluation Information

All Day Kindergarten-PIC teachers were provided with an orientation inservice in September, 1991; they were asked to respond to the Orientation Inservice Evaluation Form (see Appendix B, pp. 18-19) at the end of the session. In addition, three inservice sessions were provided for program teachers during September. At the end of each session program teachers were asked to rate the value of the session by completing the General Inservice Evaluation Form (see Appendix B, p. 20).

4. Parent Involvement Information

Parent Involvement Log. The Parent Involvement Log (locally constructed) was used to record parent involvement information. The date, the type of activity involved, the name of attendee(s), and amount of time of involvement were recorded for each activity (see Appendix B, p. 16).

Pupil Data Sheet. This instrument, described earlier, was used to summarize data from the Parent Involvement Logs. A copy can be found in Appendix B, p.17.

In addition to the types of data specified in the evaluation design, process evaluation data were obtained via on-site visitations to program classrooms. Findings are discussed later in this report. It should be noted, however, that the Private Industry Council funded All Day Kindergarten program, which served only two schools, was only a small part of the larger Columbus Public Schools All Day Kindergarten program, which served pupils in a total of twenty schools. Findings from the two Private Industry Council funded schools, Clinton and Maize Elementaries, should not be generalized across the total population of pupils served by these two programs.

Major Findings

The pupil census information is summarized in Table 1. The program served 58 pupils for an average of 13.5 hours of instruction per week. Of this number, all pupils were English speaking and one was identified as a special education pupil. The average daily membership in the program was 44.6 pupils. The average number of days scheduled per pupil was 100.8 days and the average number of days pupils were served was 91.1 days. The average number of pupils served per teacher was 29.0.

Table 1

Number of Pupils Served; Averages for Days Scheduled, Days Served, Daily Membership and Hours of Instruction Per Week for ADK-PIC Program 1991-92

Pupils Served	Girls	Boys	Average Days Scheduled	Average Days Served	Average Daily Membership	Average Hours of Instruction per Pupil per Week
58	28	30	100.8	91.1	44.6	13.5

The evaluation sample was comprised of those pupils who attended 80 percent of the program days, and had a posttest score (for Desired Outcome 1). The attendance criterion was met by 33 pupils, which was 56.9% of the 58 pupils served. Of those pupils who received a spring administration of the achievement test, 31 had a valid Balloons test score. Data from testing are presented in Table 2.

The analysis of posttest achievement data for raw score, minimum, maximum, and median are shown in Table 2. The median number of items correct on the posttest was 14. Raw scores on the test ranged from 4 to 17.

The first objective (Desired Outcome 1) called for 50 percent of the evaluation sample to demonstrate an awareness of early concepts about print such that they would successfully complete 12 of 17 items on a concepts about print test (Balloons). Desired Outcome 1 was met with 80.6% (25) of the pupils successfully completing 12 or more items on the Balloons Test at the end of the treatment period; 9.7% (3) were successful in completing all 17 items.

Table 2

Minimum, Maximum, and Median for the
Balloons Posttest Raw Scores for ADK-PIC Program
1991-92

	Posttest			Met Program Objective	
N[a]	Min.	Max.	Median	n	%
31	4	17	14	25	80.7

[a]Number of Evaluation Sample pupils.

Although the results for the number of correct responses have been presented, the reader should be wary of trying to extrapolate these results into comparisons or make generalizations concerning other pupils in the general kindergarten population. The results best reflect pupils' mastery of the specified program objective, from a very small sample, and preclude valid opportunities to make comparisons across projects using different tests.

The second Desired Outcome set a goal that parents of at least 75 percent of ADK-PIC pupils in the treatment group (those who attended the program at least 80 percent of the instructional period) would participate by visiting in the classroom, volunteering in the classroom, assisting with homework, reading to or being read to by their children, or attending parent-teacher conferences during the 1991-92 school year. Records of parent contacts and activities were maintained by program teachers. The parent involvement information is summarized in Table 3. The data indicated teachers did not make home visits nor were parents reported to be involved in any classroom planning activities during the year. Overall, the data indicated 26 (83.9%) pupils in the treatment group had parents who participated in at least one program related activity during the year. This desired outcome was achieved.

If total parent hours for each activity are used as a basis of comparison, the activity in which parents of pupils in the treatment group were most frequently involved was in group meetings and the least involvement occurred in planning. The number of parents involved is not additive since a parent could be involved in more than one activity for the year. Therefore, a yearly unduplicated count of parents who were involved with the program was obtained at the end of the school year. The annual unduplicated count of parents of all program pupils was estimated at 38.

All Day Kindergarten (Chapter 1) and ADK-PIC teachers attended four inservice meetings together during September, 1991. The topics and dates of these meetings were: (a) The Opening Orientation Inservice on, September 6, 1991; (b) The Orientation Inservice, September 10, 1991; (c) Learning to Look at Print, September 19, 1991; and (d) Emergent Writing, September 23, 1991. The General Inservice Evaluation Form was completed by 10 participants at the meetings (see Appendix, p. 20). The evaluation results of the content presented at the meetings is summarized for ADK and ADK-PIC (combined) in Table 4.

Table 3

Number of Parents of Pupils in Treatment Group and Teacher Hours by Type of Parent Involvement Activity Reported for ADK-PIC Program 1991-92

Activity	Number of Parents	Teacher Hours
Parents involved in planning	0	0
Group meetings	31	38.8
Individual conferences	28	17.9
Parents in class	6	9.6
Home visits	0	0
Total	---	66.3

Table 4

Number and Average Responses to Inservice Statements for All Meetings During 1991-92 School Year

Statements	Number Responding	Average Response	Responses SA (5)	A (4)	U (3)	D (2)	SD (1)
I think this was a very worthwhile meeting.	88	4.7	62	26	0	0	0
The information presented in the meeting will assist me in my program	88	4.8	66	22	0	0	0
There was time to ask questions pertaining to the presentation.	88	4.7	62	23	2	1	0
Questions were answered adequately.	88	4.6	63	21	2	0	0

Note: Items were rated using a 5-point scale where SD = Strongly Disagree; D = Disagree; U = Undecided; A = Agree; and SA = Strongly Agree.

While both groups were in attendance at the same meetings, though requested, teachers did not note their program differences on the evaluation form provided. Consequently, the data could not be disaggregated by program (ADK and ADK-PIC). However, overall, the evidence does indicate teachers perceived the inservice meetings were very worthwhile, the information presented was useful, and there was time to ask questions and have questions answered. Teachers did not often respond to the open-ended items provided on the evaluation form and the comments made were generally diverse in nature, but informative. Respondents valued having the opportunity to share ideas, to receive usable materials and ideas, and to receive information regarding new program and evaluation procedures.

It should be noted that the Opening Orientation Inservice Evaluation Form was specifically designed to address concerns regarding the Opening Inservice (see Appendix B, pp. 18-19). Items 1-4 of the Orientation Inservice Evaluation Form are included in Table 4. The average responses for the Program Coordinators and Evaluator's presentations was 4.3 (overall average) on a 5-point rating scale.

Process evaluation was conducted to monitor record keeping procedures of the PIC All Day Kindergarten at two points in time, November 1991 and February, 1992. The Calendar Worksheet, implemented during the 1990-91 school year, was designed to document the days of pupil program service (see Appendix B, p. 15). Each program teacher was asked to send copies of the Calendar Worksheet for a randomly selected group of program pupils to the program evaluator. Worksheets were reviewed to see if they were properly coded; those in error were corrected by phone or a short note. Needed information was supplied to those teachers having additional concerns. Calendar Worksheets were generally found to be in compliance with evaluation guidelines.

In November, 1991 the program evaluator visited all program teachers to review records. More specifically, the purpose of these visits was to review both pupil selection data, which was to be posted, and other related record keeping documents to insure that appropriate pupils were served -- even if served for only one day. Both ADK-PIC program classrooms in the two buildings were visited December 3 and 4, 1991.

The data indicated no major problems regarding the documents reviewed during the visits. However, some assistance was provided to help teachers better organize information and bring records up to date. Pupil's test scores were correctly rank ordered for selection purposes and appropriate pupils were served; suitable notations generally accompanied any exceptions in service. Informally, teachers expressed a desire that these forms be kept for record keeping purposes and used during the 1992-93 school year.

Summary/Recommendation

The All Day Kindergarten-PIC Program provided underachieving kindergarten pupils in 2 schools with an extra half day of instruction, in addition to the half day they received in a regular kindergarten classroom. The overall goal of the program was to prepare pupils for first grade. For evaluation purposes, the All Day Kindergarten-PIC Program started on September 30, 1991. For evaluation based on achievement test data (Desired Outcome 1), the time interval ended April 3, 1992. This provided a maximum of 117 possible days of instruction for ADK-PIC pupils. An additional 14 scheduled days (through May 1, 1992) were included in the time interval for evaluation of the desired outcome not based on achievement test data (Desired Outcome 2), providing a maximum of 131 possible days of instruction. To meet the attendance criterion (80%) for inclusion in the analyses of Desired Outcome 1, pupils must have attended at least 93.6 days. To meet the attendance criterion (80%) for inclusion in the analyses of Desired Outcome 2, pupils must have attended at least 104.8 days. The criteria for inclusion in the evaluation sample (Desired Outcome 1) included: (a) attendance for 80% of the program days; and (b) a valid posttest score. The attendance criterion was met by 33 pupils which was 56.9% of the 58 pupils served. Of these, 31 received an administration of the achievement test and had a valid score on the Balloons test. The criteria

for inclusion in the treatment group for Desired Outcome 2 included: those pupils in attendance for 80% of the program days. The attendance criterion was met by 31 pupils.

The first Desired Outcome called for at least 50% of the kindergarten pupils in attendance for at least 80 percent of the instructional period to demonstrate an awareness of early concepts about print such that they would successfully complete at least 12 of 17 items on a concepts about print test (Balloons). Successful completion of at least 12 of 17 items is considered appropriate for promotion to grade 1. The data indicated of those tested in the evaluation sample 25 (80.6%) pupils successfully completed 12 or more of the 17 items on the test and 3 (9.7%) pupils successfully completed all 17 items. The median score for the treatment group was 14. The data indicated that 80.7% of the pupils attained a sufficient awareness of early concepts about print believed essential to be successful in Grade 1. The Desired Outcome was achieved.

The second Desired Outcome set a goal that parents of at least 75 percent of ADK-PIC pupils in attendance for at least 80 percent of the instructional period would participate by visiting in the classroom, volunteering in the classroom, assisting with homework, reading to or being read to by their children, or attending parent-teacher conferences during the 1991-92 school year. Records of parent contacts and activities were maintained by ADK-PIC teachers. The Desired Outcome was achieved for 83.9% of the pupils.

If total parent hours for each activity are used as a basis for comparison, parents of pupils in the treatment group were most frequently involved in group meetings and least involved in classroom planning. The data also indicated teachers did not make home visits, nor were parents reported to be involved in planning during the year. Of the pupils in the treatment group, 83.9% (26) had parents who participated in at least one program related activity during the year. The evaluation data indicated the parent involvement effort was successful.

Program teachers attended four inservice meetings during the school year. ADK and ADK-PIC teachers attended the same meetings. Teachers did not indicate program differences on the evaluation form provided. Consequently, the data could not be disaggregated by program (ADK and ADK-PIC). However, the meetings overall received a very positive rating of 4.7 on a 5-point scale by program teachers. Comments indicated teachers valued the opportunity to share ideas for classroom use, receive useable materials, and to receive information regarding new program/evaluation procedures. Teachers expressed a desire for such meetings to occur again.

Process evaluation was conducted to monitor pupil selection procedures of teachers. On-site visitation and inspection of records were instrumental in this process. The data indicated no major problems regarding the documents reviewed for those teachers visited. However, some assistance was provided to help teachers better organize information and bring records up to date. Informally, teachers expressed a desire that the current record keeping process be maintained for use during the 1991-92 school year.

In conjunction with the findings of the Chapter 1 All Day Kindergarten Program, it is recommended that the All Day Kindergarten program be continued in the 1992-93 school year. The following recommendations are made to enhance program success:

1. Teachers should be encouraged to continue parent involvement efforts and to employ those methods and techniques found to be successful.

2. Program teachers should be provided more inservice meetings to: (a) share instructional ideas to increase skills and broaden their base of understanding of beginning readers as it relates to the

new reading series, (b) support their efforts and heighten their level of parent involvement skills, and (c) enhance program management skills.

3. The program evaluator should increase classroom visitation to enhance the record keeping process, respond to questions about evaluation requirements, and obtain pertinent information. These visits provide useful information regarding evaluation and related concerns of the program teacher.

Reference

Columbus Public Schools. (1990). First Grade Screening Instrument (Balloons Test). Columbus, OH: Federal and State Programs. Instructional Assistant Program.

Appendix A

Footnotes

Footnotes

[1]The Balloons: Concepts About Print Assessment (1990) is a locally constructed measure developed by a writing team of selected classroom teachers, reading resource teachers, and staff members from Federal and State Programs, under the directions of the Division of Elementary Schools. The test was initially developed as a first grade screening instrument to assist teachers in implementing appropriate instruction for program pupils. The test consisted of the trade book Balloons (written by Nancy A. Stuck, a pseudonym for two program coordinators) and a 17 item criterion-referenced test based on the research and two trade books of Dr. Marie Clay (1972, 1979, 1985).

The test was found to have application for kindergarten use in 1990 and was selected by Federal and State Programs to meet program needs and those needs delineated by federal evaluation guidelines. The test was assumed to be an appropriate measure to assess the degree to which pupils had acquired those skills which support reading acquisition and presumed needed for promotion to first grade.

Appendix B

Instruments

SCORING SHEET FOR B A L L O O N S

Name _____ School _____

Date _____ Room _____

PROCEDURES	DIRECTIONS	CRITERIA	YES	NO	OBJECTIVES
Hold the book vertically by the outside edge, spine toward the child.	"I'm going to read this book to you, but I want you to help me." "Show me the front of the book."	Child must point to front cover of the book.			Child knows front from back of book.
READ THE TITLE OF THE BOOK					
Open the book to page 2.	"I'll read this story. You help me. Show me where to start reading."	Child must point to any part of the page with text.			Child knows that the print, not the picture, carries the message.
READ PAGE 2					
Turn to page 4/5	"Where do I start to read?"	Child must point to the word "I".			Child knows to begin reading at top left of the print.
	"Which way do I go?"	Child must indicate left to right movement across top line of print.			Child knows left to right movement.
	"Where do I go next?"	Child must point to the word "and".			Child knows return sweep.
READ PAGE 4 AND MODEL POINTING					
Turn to page 6/7	"Where do I start to read?"	Child must point to any place on page 6.			Child knows that left page is read before right page.
READ PAGE 6 AND MODEL POINTING					
Point to page 7	"You point while I read this page."	Child must point to each word as it is read slowly.			Child knows one-to-one word match.
READ PAGE 7					

PROCEDURES	DIRECTIONS	CRITERIA	YES	NO	OBJECTIVES
Turn to page 9	"You point while I read."	Child must point to each word as it is read slowly.			Child knows one-to-one word match.
READ PAGE 9					
Turn to page 11	"Now you point and read."	Child must read and point correctly to each word as he reads it.			Child knows one-to-one word maich and is able to read accurately.
Turn to page 13	"You point and read."	Child must read and correctly point, etc.			Same as above.
Turn to page 14	"You point and read."	Child must read and correctly point, etc.			Same as above.
Turn to page 15	"You point and read."	Child must read accurately.			Child is able to read accurately.
READ PAGE 17					
Teacher directs student to move cards to complete each task. **DEMONSTRATE**					
Place the cards outside the print.	"Move these cards and show me one letter."	Child must show one letter only.			Child knows concept of a letter.
Place the cards outside the print.	"Move these cards and show me two letters."	Child must show two letters only.			Child knows concept of two letters.
Place the cards outside the print.	"Move these cards and show me one word."	Child must show one word only.			Child knows concept of a word.
Place the cards outside the print.	"Move these cards and show me two words."	Child must show two words only.			Child knows concept of two words.
Place the cards outside the print.	"Move these cards and show me a 'capital' or 'upper case' letter.	Child must show the capital letter.			Child knows concept of capital letter.
19		Total Number of 'YES' Responses			20

* CALENDAR WORKSHEET FOR RECORDING DAYS OF PUPIL SERVICE *

1991-92

All Day Kindergarten Program

Student's Legal Name _____ (Last, First)

Student's Birthdate _ _ _ _ _ _ (M M D D Y Y)

Student Number _ _ _ _ _ _

Race Code _____ (1-5) Sex _____ (M or F)

Note: Please keep original worksheets for all pupils (even for pupils who leave). Do not send to program coordinator or to other schools.

Grade Level 0 0

Selection Score _ _

Teacher Name _____

Program Code _ _ _ _ _

School _____

School Code _ _ _

1991-92	M	T	W	TH	F	M	T	W	TH	F	M	T	W	TH	F	M	T	W	TH	F	TOTALS Schdl. (1,2)	TOTALS Served (2)
Aug. 26 - Sept. 20	M	M	28	29	30	H	3	4	5	6	9	10	11	12	13	16	17	18	19	20	//////////	//////////
(No scheduled days)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	\\\\\\\\\\	\\\\\\\\\\
Sept. 23 - Oct. 18	23	24	25	26	27	30	1	2	3	4	7	8	9	10	11	14	15	16	17	COTA		
(Max. schdl. days=19)																				0		
Oct. 21 - Nov. 15	21	22	23	24	25	28	29	30	31	1	4	5	6	7	8	11	12	13	14	PC		
(Max. schdl. days=19)																				0		
Nov. 18 - Dec. 13	18	19	20	21	22	25	26	27	H	N	2	3	4	5	6	9	10	11	12	13		
(Max. schdl. days=18)									0	0												
Dec. 16 - Jan. 24	16	17	18	19	20	6	7	8	9	10	13	14	15	16	17	H	21	22	23	24		
(Max. schdl. days=19)																0						
Jan. 27 - Feb. 21	27	28	29	30	31	3	4	5	6	7	10	11	12	13	PC	17	18	19	20	21		
(Max. schdl. days=19)															0							
Feb. 24 - Mar. 20	24	25	26	27	28	2	3	4	5	6	9	10	11	12	13	16	17	18	19	20		
(Max. schdl. days=20)																						
Mar. 23 - Apr. 17	23	24	25	26	27	30	31	1	2	3	6	7	8	9	10	13	14	15	16	N		
(Max. schdl. days=19)																				0		
Apr. 20 - May 15	N	N	N	N	N	27	28	29	30	1	4	5	6	7	8	11	12	13	14	15		
(Max. schdl. days=05)	0	0	0	0	0						0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
May 18 - June 12	18	19	20	21	22	H	26	27	28	29	1	2	3	4	R	8	9	10	11	12	//////////	//////////
(No scheduled days)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	\\\\\\\\\\	\\\\\\\\\\

TOTALS

Kindergarten	Scheduled	Served
(Max. scheduled=133)		
(Max. served =133)		

RACE CODES

1 = Non-Minority
2 = Black
3 = Spanish Surname
4 = Asian American
5 = American Indian

SERVICE CODES

0 = Pupil Not Scheduled (Inservice, Teacher Illness, Personal Day, Snow Day, Parent Conference Day, etc.)
1 = Pupil Scheduled and Not Served (Absent from School/Class)
2 = Pupil Served (Pupil Present)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ESEA - Chapter 1
Parent Involvement Log
1991-92

Program Code _____ Name of Pupil _____ Grade _____

Parent Name _____ Address _____ Phone Number _____

THE COLLECTION OF PARENT INVOLVEMENT DATA IS REQUIRED BY CHAPTER 1.

Please check if the following two activities occurred for this pupil anytime this year.

☐ Parent helped child with homework

☐ Parent read to child or child read to parent

DIRECTIONS: Please indicate in the fields below the activity, name of parent/guardian, and the hours they were involved in the Chapter 1 project. ROUND HOURS TO THE NEAREST TENTH. Obviously, you may keep expanded notes about activities somewhere else.

Date MMDDYY	Activity* (1-5)	Attendee(s) Parent/Guardian	Hours 00.0
			__.__
			__.__
			__.__
			__.__
			__.__
			__.__
			__.__
			__.__
			__.__
			__.__
			__.__
			__.__
			__.__
			__.__

*Kinds of Parent Involvement to record for the column labeled Activity

(1) Involved in planning (do not include advisory council)
(2) Group meetings (do not include advisory council)
(3) Individual conferences (telephone conferences included)
(4) Parental classroom visits
(5) Home visits

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Columbus Public Schools
Compensatory Education Programs

April 15, 1992
10:41

SHEET 1

PUPIL DATA SHEET

SCHOOL CODE ___ PROGRAM CODE _____ SSN _____

SCHOOL NAME _____ PROGRAM NAME _____ TEACHER NAME _____

1. STUDENT NAME _____

2. STUDENT NO. _____ GRADE __ BIRTHDATE __ / __ / __

3. PUPIL PROGRESS NONE SOME MUCH

4. HOURS PER WEEK OF INSTRUCTION |__|__| . |__|

5. IS THIS PUPIL ENGLISH SPEAKING? NO YES

6. PARENT VOLUNTEERED IN CLASSROOM? NO YES

7. PARENT HELPED WITH HOMEWORK? NO YES

8. PARENT READS TO CHILD OR CHILD READS TO PARENT? NO YES

FOR NUMBERS 9-13, FILL IN THE NUMBER OF THIS PUPIL'S PARENTS INVOLVED IN EACH ACTIVITY DURING THE YEAR AND CUMMULATIVE HOURS OF CONTACT

	NO. OF PARENTS	NO. OF HOURS
9. PLANNING	|__|	|__|__|__| . |__|
10. GROUP MEETINGS	|__|	|__|__|__| . |__|
11. INDIVIDUAL CONFERENCES	|__|	|__|__|__| . |__|
12. CLASSROOM VISITS	|__|	|__|__|__| . |__|
13. HOME VISITS	|__|	|__|__|__| . |__|

	THRU 04-03-92	FROM 04-06-92 THRU 05-01-92
14. NUMBER OF DAYS SERVICE SCHEDULED (CAREFULLY READ INSTRUCTIONS)	|__|__|__|	|__|__|
15. NUMBER OF DAYS SERVICE RECEIVED (CAREFULLY READ INSTRUCTIONS)	|__|__|__|	|__|__|

16. BALLOONS SCORE |__|__| OF POSSIBLE 17.

Prepared by
Office of the Deputy Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation

ESEA CHAPTER 1, CHAPTER 2, AND DPPF
ORIENTATION INSERVICE EVALUATION FORM
1991-92 ORIENTATION

Date of Orientation Meeting_____A.M.___ P.M.___

Circle only the program(s) you are in:

ESEA Chapter 2 Program:
(1) FDK

ESEA Chapter 1 Programs:
(2) ADK
(3) Reading-Elementary (2-5)
(4) Mathematics-Elementary (3-5)
(5) Reading-Middle School (6-8)
(6) Mathematics-Middle School (6-8)
(7) N or D (1-12)
(8) Nonpublic (1-8)
(9) Reading Recovery (1)
(10) Chap. 1 Early Literacy (1-2)

DPPF Programs:
(11) Instructional Assistant - K
(12) Instructional Assistant - 1
(13) Early Literacy (2)

Other (Specify)
(14) _____

Circle the number that indicates the extent to which you agree with statements 1-4, in rating the overall day of inservice.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. I think this was a very worthwhile inservice.	5	4	3	2	1
2. The information presented in this inservice will assist me in my program.	5	4	3	2	1
3. There was time to ask questions pertaining to the presentations.	5	4	3	2	1
4. Questions were answered adequately.	5	4	3	2	1

Circle the number that indicates how you would rate each of the following portions of today's inservice in regard to interest and usefulness of presentations.

	Superior	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
5. Program Coordinators' Presentation					
a. Interest	5	4	3	2	1
b. Usefulness	5	4	3	2	1
c. Clarity of instructions	5	4	3	2	1

****
*
* Please turn over for questions 6-9 *
*
****

	Superior	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
6. Evaluation Presentation					
a. Interest	5	4	3	2	1
b. Usefulness	5	4	3	2	1
c. Clarity of instructions	5	4	3	2	1

7. What was the most valuable part of this meeting?_____

_____

8. What was the least valuable part of this meeting?_____

_____

9. What additional information or topics would you like to see covered in future meetings?

_____

_____

_____

GENERAL INSERVICE EVALUATION FORM
1991-92

Inservice Topic: _____

Presenter(s): _____

Date: ____/____/____ (e.g., 03/05/92)
MM DD YY

Session (Check only one): _____ all day _____a.m. _____ p.m.

Circle only the program(s) you are in:

ESEA Chapter 2 Program:
(1) FDK

ESEA Chapter 1 Programs:
(2) ADK
(3) Reading-Elementary (2-5)
(4) Mathematics-Elementary (3-5)
(5) Reading-Middle School (6-8)
(6) Mathematics-Middle School (6-8)
(7) N or D (1-12)
(8) Non-Public (1-8)
(9) Reading Recovery (1)
(10) Early Literacy (1-2)

DPPF Programs:
(11) Instructional Assistant - K
(12) Instructional Assistant - 1
(13) Early Literacy (2)

Other (Specify)
(14) _____

Circle the number that indicates the extent to which you agree or disagree with statements 1-4.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. I think this was a very worthwhile meeting.	5	4	3	2	1
2. The information presented in this meeting will assist me in my program.	5	4	3	2	1
3. There was time to ask questions pertaining to the presentation.	5	4	3	2	1
4. Questions were answered adequately.	5	4	3	2	1

5. What was the most valuable part of this meeting? _____

_____

6. What was the least valuable part of this meeting? _____

_____

7. Please list any additional information or topics you would like to see covered in future meetings. a) _____

b) _____

c) _____